

**REMARKS**

The present application was filed on September 1, 2000, with claims 1-24. Claims 1-24 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 13 and 21 are the independent claims.

Claims 1-7 and 12-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,580,460 (hereinafter "Takahashi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,933,981 (hereinafter "Kishida").

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Kishida and U.S. Patent No. 5,392,447 (hereinafter "Schlack").

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §103(a) rejections on the grounds that the Takahashi and Kishida references collectively fail to meet the limitations of the independent claims as previously presented, and that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Takahashi and Kishida in the manner proposed by the Examiner.

Notwithstanding the traversal, Applicants have amended the independent claims to further clarify the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the control signal received from the basic device provides an indication from the basic device to the accessory device that the accessory device is to be powered on using a power source internal to the accessory device. Further, the claim has been amended to clarify that the control signal triggers a transition of the accessory device from a powered-off state in which the power supply unit is deactivated and the control processor is powered off to a powered-on state in which the power supply unit is activated and the control processor is powered on. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification at, for example, page 5, lines 1-11.

In formulating the §103(a) rejection of claim 1 over Takahashi and Kishida, the Examiner argues that the recited control processor and power supply unit of claim 1 are met by the respective control unit 104 and power management unit 108 in the digital image sensing device 117 of Takahashi. Further, the Examiner argues that the recited control signal of claim 1 is "the signal indicating the power supply capacity

from the printer,” where the printer is element 118 in FIG. 1 of Takahashi. See the Office Action at page 3, first paragraph, and page 4, last paragraph. However, it is clear that the digital image sensing device 117 is already powered on using its internal battery 109 when the signal indicating the power supply capacity from printer 118 is received. Thus, control unit 104 and power management unit 108 are already powered on. This is apparent from, for example, column 13, lines 6-20, of Takahashi. Accordingly, the identified control signal in Takahashi does not provide an indication from the basic device to the accessory device that the accessory device is to be powered on using a power source internal to the accessory device. Nor does the identified control signal in Takahashi trigger a transition of the accessory device from a powered-off state in which the power supply unit is deactivated and the control processor is powered off to a powered-on state in which the power supply unit is activated and the control processor is powered on.

Similarly, the identified control signal in Kishida, namely, the “detection result of whether or not the camera is connected to the computer,” does not meet the limitations associated with the recited control signal of claim 1. This is because the identified control signal in Kishida does not provide an indication from the basic device to the accessory device that the accessory device is to be powered on using a power source internal to the accessory device. Instead, once the camera 52 is connected to the computer PC1 in Kishida, power is automatically supplied from the PC1 power supply 317 to the camera 52. See Kishida at column 14, lines 17-28.

It is therefore believed that the collective teachings of Takahashi and Kishida fail to meet the limitations of claim 1 as amended.

Moreover, as indicated previously, it is believed that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Takahashi and Kishida in the manner proposed. These references teach different and fundamentally incompatible approaches to powering an accessory device from a basic device. Takahashi initially powers up digital image sensing device 117 using its internal battery supply 109 and subsequently determines if power can instead be supplied to device 117 from a source internal to the connected printer 118. Kishida automatically powers up the camera 52 using the internal power supply 317 of PC1 as soon as camera 52 is connected to PC1. Thus, it is

not clear why or how one skilled in the art would combine these two disparate techniques. It should also be noted that both Takahashi and Kishida suffer from substantially the same problems identified by Applicants at page 1, lines 16-28, of their specification. This is because both references teach automatic powering of the accessory device from a power source of the basic device, which will tend to place an excessive burden on the batteries or other internal power source of the basic device. These references, taken individually or collectively, are thus believed to teach away from the claimed arrangements, in which a basic device provides a control signal that tends to minimize unnecessary powering up of the accessory device.

Independent claims 13 and 21 have also been amended in a manner similar to that described above in the context of claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-12, 14-20 and 22-24 are believed allowable for the reasons identified above with regard to their respective independent claims.

It is believed that the claims in the application are allowable over the prior art and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Pamela R. Crocker  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 42,447

PRC:dsg  
Telephone: (585) 477-0553  
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646